DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 206 336 JC 810 423

AUTHOR Chalker, C. David
TITLE Presidents' Perceptions of the Role of Institutional Research in Rural Junior Colleges in the Southeast.
PUB DATE Jul 81
NOTE 15p.: Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Southeastern Association for Community College Research (Orlando, FL, July 20-22, 1981).

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Administrator Attitudes; Administrator Responsibility; College Administration; College Presidents; *Community Colleges; Financial Support; Institutional Characteristics; *Institutional Research; Research Directors; Research Problems; *Research Utilization; Rural Schools; Surveys; Two Year Colleges
IDENTIFIERS United States (Southeast)

ABSTRACT

In February 1980, a survey was conducted of 135 rural community/junior colleges in the Southeast to determine the college president's perception of the role and activities of the office of institutional research (OIR). Specifically, the survey instrument solicited information concerning: (1) the OIR's areas of inquiry with regard to administrative, financial, and goals-related issues; (2) the place of the OIR in defining the college's role; (3) the role of advisory committees of institutional personnel in institutional research activities; (4) financial support provided for the OIR; and (5) the OIR's role in facilities planning. The survey instrument also solicited institutional data to permit a comparison of college responses in terms of institutional size and age and the number of years the OIR existed. The survey revealed that of the 75 colleges providing usable responses, 69% had institutional research offices. Their responses permit several conclusions. Many schools had inadequate institutional research programs, due in part to lack of funds, lack of emphasis from the administration, and lack of a full-time director. Most presidents felt the OIR's role should be restricted to the compilation of reports, with only 35% of the presidents feeling it desirable for the OIR to suggest specific actions. The study report describes the survey methodology and findings, presents conclusions, and includes the questionnaire. (AYC)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED206336

PRESIDENTS' PERCEPTIONS OF THE ROLE OF INSTITUTIONAL RESEARCH IN RURAL JUNIOR COLLEGES IN THE SOUTHEAST

C. David Chalker
Enterprise State Junior College

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

C. David Chalker

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

Paper presented at the annual meeting of the
Southeastern Association for Community College Research
July, 1981 - Orlando, Florida

JC 810 423

PRESIDENTS' PERCEPTIONS OF THE ROLE OF INSTITUTIONAL RESEARCH IN RURAL JUNIOR COLLEGES IN THE SOUTHEAST

Introduction

With an increased emphasis on research and development in the community college, the collection and analysis of pertinent information for planning and policy formation has become exceedingly important. The emphasis toward business-like management has brought with it a demand for an office of institutional research, which can assemble, analyze and translate data into information for decision-making relevant to short- and long-range planning. These demands are especially pertinent to smaller rural community/junior colleges and thereby created a demand for this study. There were three objectives of this study:

1. To identify the existence and organizational level of the offices of institutional research in rural community/junior colleges in the southeast.
2. To identify the relationship between institutional research and the college's administrative planning structure.
3. To identify the actual and/or desired practices of an office of institutional research as perceived by the president.

A survey instrument was designed for this study. A basic instrument by Joseph A. Greenberg was restructured with some additions and deletions to gather the information needed to satisfy the purposes of the study. The survey instrument consisted of four major parts. The first part was about the areas of inquiry for the OIR. This part was subdivided into the following

sub-sections:

1. Definition of role.
2. Use of an advisory committee
3. Coordination of studies.
4. Preparation of reports.
5. Dissemination of findings.

Part III of the survey instrument pertained to organization and operation of the college. This part was divided into the following sub-sections:

1. Organizational position of the director of the OIR.
2. Level of activity (reports to whom).
3. Functions of the OIR.
4. Organizational placement of the director.
5. Professional experience and educational preparation of the OIR director.
6. Financial support.
7. Facilities and equipment.

Part IV of the survey instrument was designed to gather supplementary data about the institutions participating in the study. They were asked to respond to major questions about the official current enrollment, whether or not their institution had experienced an increase or decrease in FTE students.

For validation purposes, copies of the survey instrument were sent to five presidents not included in the study. They also were given copies of the study objectives and asked to evaluate the instrument with the stated objectives in mind. Their comments were considered when the instrument was structured in final form.

Copies of the survey instrument were sent on February 22, 1980, to the 135 public junior colleges holding membership in the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools which met the criteria established for rural colleges--colleges located in a community of less than 25,000 population and not located in a Standard Metropolitan Statistical Area (SMSA) based on the 1970 United States Census. The survey was addressed to the president of the various colleges.

On March 10, 1980, a second request for information was sent to all college presidents who had not responded to the first request. By March 23, a total of 74 replies had been received from the colleges surveyed producing a 55 percent response. On March 31, the final request for information was sent to all institutions that had not responded. By April 11, another 12 replies were received. No replies were received between April 19 and April 30. The response period was closed on April 30. The 86 responses from the 135 colleges resulted in a 63.7 percent return. Responses were received from every state in the Southern Association region, except Louisiana. The colleges were divided into small - (0-1000 FTE) medium (1000-2000 FTE) and large (over 2000 FTE) for the purposes of this study.

Summary of the Findings

This study was designed for the three statements of purpose listed above. The findings are summarized including these three points. Presidents were asked to respond to actual practices as outlined on the survey instrument and to their desired practice.

Part IV of the survey instrument was included to determine the size of the institution, by student FTE, whether or not the college had a research

office, how long it had had an IR office and whether or not the college had experienced an increase or decrease in enrollment over the past three years.

Of the 135 colleges included in the study, 86 or 64% completed the survey in some form and returned it. However, only 75 of the 86 surveys were included in the overall analysis, the other 11 were not completed sufficiently.

Of the 86 colleges responding, 46 (53%) indicated their size as being between 0 and 1,000 full-time equivalent students. Thirty-four (40%) of the colleges indicated that their size was between 1,000 FTE and 2,000 FTE. Six (7%) of the colleges were in the group with over 2,000 FTE. Fifty-two (69%) of the useable survey responses indicated an office of institutional research. Twenty-four (62%) of the small colleges indicated an office of institutional research, with average age for the office just over four years. Also 24 (62%) of the medium sized institutions indicated an office of institutional research with an average office age of almost five and one-half years. Of the useable instruments from the large schools, four (66%) of the six indicated an office of institutional research, with an average office age of almost four and one-half years.

One indirect purpose of this study was to see if there was any correlation between an increase or decrease in FTE students and the existence or non-existence of an office of institutional research. Overall, all the categories of institutions--small, medium and large--having an office of IR had a larger percent of student increase than did the colleges without an OIR. A majority (69%) of the colleges surveyed had an office of institutional research. However, only 37% of the presidents indicated that the IR office was coordinated by an administrator on a full-time basis. The range was a low of 24% in the small colleges to a high of 50% in the large institutions.

Overall, 58% of the presidents indicated that it was desirable to have a full-time administrator coordinate the research office. Just over 50% of the colleges indicated that their IR director was an administrator on a part-time basis with the medium and large indicating each near 50%. Sixty-eight percent of the small colleges' IR offices were coordinated by an administrator on a part-time basis. Only one small institution and two medium sized institutions reported that their IR office was coordinated by a faculty member on a part-time basis.

In over 65% of the colleges, the IR director reported to the president; however, only 54% indicated this as a desired practice. Nineteen percent of the directors reported to a vice-president and 21% reported to a dean. The desired percentages in both categories were comparable to the actual practice.

A definite relationship between the institutional research office and the colleges' overall administrative planning structure was indicated. Over 75% of the presidents reported the collection of data and the direct involvement in development, evaluation and control of operations. This ranged from a high of 100% in the large institutions to 75% in the small and 74% in the medium sized colleges. The chi-square analysis of the data reported on the survey instruments indicated more involvement by the OIR in planning and decision-making when the director reported to a president or vice-president. The analysis also showed direct involvement with problem solving and long-range theoretically-oriented research.

Concerning the long-range activities of the OIR, over 60% of the presidents reported that the OIR was concerned with the relationship of policies and procedures to achieving the goals of the college. As the size of the colleges increased, there was a higher incidence of reporting this

as an actual practice. One of the major indicators of involvement in the administrative process is the use of the OIR in the analysis and prediction of budget trends.

Forty-six percent of the colleges reporting indicated that there was actual involvement of the OIR in the analysis of budget trends. There was a much larger incidence of actual practice in the larger colleges (75%) as compared to the medium (44%) and the small colleges (43%). However, over 65% of the presidents overall reported that this was an area of desired practice for their OIR.

One of the more important functions that an OIR can perform is the collection and analysis of data concerning current social and economic conditions of the colleges' service area. Over 57% of the presidents reported that their OIR was involved in this activity, with the larger institutions reporting the highest involvement.

Systematic and continual evaluation of college goals and objectives is imperative. The providing of data for such evaluation was listed as an actual practice for 75% of the larger colleges and 56% for both the small and medium colleges.

Should the reports produced by the OIR let the facts speak for themselves or should they suggest alternative courses of action? Over 61% of the presidents indicated that they should indicate alternative courses of action. The large and medium sized institutions reported 75% and 75% respectively and the small colleges reported only 48% that the actual practice of the research office would be to suggest alternative courses of action.

However, the presidents were not so eager to have the OIR recommend specific courses of action. Overall, 44% reported this as an actual practice

at their institution. Again, the significant difference was between the large (50%) and medium (60%) and the small (28%). Evidently, the smaller the school, the less emphasis the IR office has in recommending specific courses of action. Only 35% of the presidents thought that this was a desirable practice.

The presidents indicated that, with regard to dissemination of research reports, the most common determinant would be by purpose and content of the study. Dissemination should be determined by the reasons for the study and who requested the information.

The OIR is responsible for initiating studies, repeating certain studies over a period of time to perfect methodology and identify trend data, interpreting the results of studies (87% of the presidents reported this was an actual practice), completing questionnaires seeking institutional data, and conducting studies of practices at other colleges.

The last responsibility was included to ascertain the presidents' perception of the importance of studying what other community/junior colleges are doing. Only 48% of the presidents indicated that this was an actual practice at their institution and the desired practice was only 52%.

Certain questions of the survey were designed to determine the professional teaching, administrative or general working experience and also the educational preparation of the director of the OIR. Overall, over 70% of the directors had teaching experience in a community/junior college. But only 64% of the presidents indicated that teaching experience was a desirable characteristic for a director or coordinator of IR. Seventy-seven percent of the presidents indicated that their directors had administrative experience in a community/junior college. Again, the desired practice was lower (65%) than the actual practice. Over 76% of the presidents indicated that their

director of IR was a generalist, acquainted with all aspects of community/ junior college operations.

The parameters of educational preparation were, from a graduate major in educational research and statistics, graduate course work in research and statistics, to graduate course work in higher education. The highest indication of educational preparation was in the area of graduate course work in higher education--85% of the presidents indicated this. Seventy-five percent of the larger colleges, 70% of the medium sized schools and 68% of the small colleges indicated graduate course work in the area of educational research and statistics. Overall, over 73% of the presidents reported this as a desired practice.

The presidents were asked to respond to the area of the director's knowledge and application of electronic data processing. Seventy-seven percent of the presidents reported their director knowledgeable in this field; however, only 52% indicated application of this knowledge.

Several questions were included to determine the financial support of the OIR. The following areas and percentages indicate the major support:

Area	Colleges Overall
Data Processing	54%
Secretarial and Duplicating	89%
Conference and Workshops	81%
Consultants	32%

Only 37% of the presidents indicated that IR funding was provided in a separate item of the college budget.

General Conclusions

On the basis of the findings of the study, the following conclusions seem to be justified:

1. The lack of an institutional research director with adequate time to devote to institutional research and the relative newness of the position in many colleges is a major deterrent to the development of an effective office of institutional research.
2. Many rural community/junior colleges in the southeast have inadequate programs of institutional research. IR studies are limited because of the lack of funds, lack of emphasis from the administrative structure, and lack of a full-time director.
3. The office of institutional research is a supplier of information for decision-making and could be more directly involved in the decision-making, including long-range research to improve institutional performance.
4. Most presidents in the study believe the office of institutional research should compile the reports and let the facts speak for themselves, with some limited suggestion of alternative courses of action.
5. The directors of institutional research are not utilizing fully the electronic data processing capabilities for data analysis and storage.
6. The OIR is not provided adequate financial support from the institution with regard to funds, equipment and facilities.
7. Institutional research offices can be strengthened in rural junior colleges through the employment of full-time directors and more involvement in the administrative process.
8. Colleges with an office of institutional research had a larger percentage increase in full-time equivalent students than colleges without an OIR.

A STUDY OF THE ROLE OF
INSTITUTIONAL RESEARCH IN RURAL
COMMUNITY/JUNIOR COLLEGES IN THE SOUTHEAST

GENERAL INFORMATION

1. THE TERM ''INSTITUTIONAL RESEARCH,'' AS USED IN THIS STUDY, REFERS TO THE COLLECTION AND ANALYSIS OF PERTINENT INFORMATION IN A SYSTEMATIC SELF-STUDY IN THE COLLEGE DESIGNED TO IMPROVE THE INSTITUTION.

2. IF YOU HAVE AN OFFICE OF INSTITUTIONAL RESEARCH, OR PROVIDE FOR INSTITUTIONAL RESEARCH ACTIVITIES THROUGH A COMMITTEE OR PART-TIME FACULTY OR STAFF MEMBER, OR ON ANY OTHER BASIS, PLEASE RESPOND TO ALL ITEMS ON THE QUESTIONNAIRE; IF YOU DO NOT PROVIDE FOR INSTITUTIONAL RESEARCH ACTIVITIES ON ANY BASIS, PLEASE INDICATE THIS FACT BY CHECKING THE BOX TO THE RIGHT, AND THEN RESPOND ONLY TO COLUMN 2 ON THE ATTACHED QUESTIONNAIRE AND TO ITEMS 69-72. ALSO, PLEASE COMPLETE ITEM 3 BELOW. ☐

3. IF YOU DO NOT PROVIDE FOR INSTITUTIONAL RESEARCH ACTIVITIES ON ANY BASIS:
   A. DO YOU THINK YOU SHOULD?
      YES ☐
      NO ☐

   B. IF YOUR ANSWER TO 3A (ABOVE) IS YES, THEN WHAT ARE THE RESTRAINTS PREVENTING YOU FROM ESTABLISHING AN OFFICE OF INSTITUTIONAL RESEARCH?

      1. _____

      2. _____

      3. _____

DIRECTIONS

AS A COMMUNITY/JUNIOR COLLEGE PRESIDENT, YOU ARE ASKED TO RESPOND TO EACH ITEM WITHIN THE VARIOUS AREAS OF INQUIRY PRESENTED. PLEASE READ EACH STATEMENT LISTED BELOW AND RESPOND AS FOLLOWS:

COLUMN 1: CIRCLE YES OR NO AS TO WHETHER THE ACTION OR CONCERN LISTED IN THE STATEMENT IS AN ACTUAL PRACTICE OF YOUR ''OFFICE'' OF INSTITUTIONAL RESEARCH. (LEAVE BLANK IF YOU CHECKED THE BOX IN NUMBER 2 ABOVE)

COLUMN 2: CIRCLE YES OR NO AS TO WHETHER THE ACTION OR CONCERN LISTED IN THE STATEMENT WOULD BE A DESIRED PRACTICE FOR YOUR ''OFFICE'' OF INSTITUTIONAL RESEARCH WHETHER OR NOT YOU HAVE ONE.

COLUMN 3: IF YOUR ACTUAL PRACTICE IS NOT YOUR DESIRED PRACTICE, THEN IDENTIFY THE RESTRAINING FORCES THAT HAVE PREVENTED THE CHANGE FROM ACTUAL TO DESIRED. (LEAVE BLANK IF NO OFFICE.) THE FOLLOWING ARE IDENTIFIED AS POSSIBLE RESTRAINING FORCES (NOT IN ANY PRIORITY ORDER) WHICH YOU MIGHT REFER TO IN COMPLETING COLUMN 3 BY THEIR NUMBER. PLEASE WRITE IN ANY OTHERS THAT YOU THINK IMPORTANT:

1. NOT WITHIN THE FUNCTION OF THE OFFICE OF INSTITUTIONAL RESEARCH
2. TIME LIMITATIONS
3. FINANCIAL LIMITATIONS
4. GOVERNING BOARD POLICY
5. PERSONNEL LIMITATIONS (NOT ENOUGH PEOPLE)
6. SPACE LIMITATIONS (CAMPUS FACILITIES UNAVAILABLE)

PART I. AREAS OF INQUIRY FOR THE OFFICE OF INSTITUTIONAL RESEARCH

SECTION A. ADMINISTRATION: THE OFFICE OF INSTITUTIONAL RESEARCH IS CONCERNED WITH:	COLUMN 1 ACTUAL PRACTICE		COLUMN 2 DESIRED PRACTICE		COLUMN 3 RESTRAINING FORCES
1. THE ADHERENCE OF THE COLLEGE TO THE DEFINITIONS OF ADMINISTRATIVE FUNCTIONS AS DEFINED IN YOUR POLICIES AND PROCEDURES MANUAL.	YES	NO	YES	NO	
2. THE EFFECTIVENESS OF VARIOUS POLICY AND PROGRAM DECISION-MAKING BODIES (E.G. COMMITTEES, BOARDS, ASSEMBLIES, SENATES, ETC.)	YES	NO	YES	NO	
3. THE UNDERSTANDING, ACCEPTANCE, AND/OR SUPPORT OF PRESENT MODES OF GOVERNANCE BY FACULTY.	YES	NO	YES	NO	
4. THE RELATIONSHIP OF POLICIES AND PROCEDURES TO ACHIEVING THE GOALS OF THE COLLEGE.	YES	NO	YES	NO	
SECTION B. FINANCE: THE OFFICE OF INSTITUTIONAL RESEARCH IS CONCERNED WITH:					
5. THE ANALYSIS OF BUDGET TRENDS OVER A PERIOD OF YEARS.	YES	NO	YES	NO	
6. FUNDS NEEDED TO PROVIDE FOR INCREASED ENROLLMENT AND/OR EXPANSION OF SERVICES.	YES	NO	YES	NO	
7. CONDITIONS OF FACILITIES AND EQUIPMENT IN CONNECTION WITH THEIR IMPACT UPON NEEDS FOR FUNDS.	YES	NO	YES	NO	
8. THE PROJECTED ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT OF YOUR REGION IN ITS RELATIONSHIP TO THE OUTLOOK FOR FUTURE FUNDING.	YES	NO	YES	NO	
SECTION C. GOALS: THE OFFICE OF INSTITUTIONAL RESEARCH IS CONCERNED WITH:					
9. THE ORGANIZATION OF THE COLLEGE TO ACHIEVE ITS GOALS.	YES	NO	YES	NO	
10. THE RELATIONSHIP OF INSTITUTIONAL GOALS TO CURRENT SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC ENVIRONMENTS.	YES	NO	YES	NO	
11. THE SELF-EVALUATION OF THE OFFICE OF INSTITUTIONAL RESEARCH.	YES	NO	YES	NO	
12. THE ADEQUACY OF STATED GOALS AND OBJECTIVES AS A REFERENCE FOR DECISION MAKING.	YES	NO	YES	NO	
13. THE RELATIONSHIP OF PLANS FOR THE FUTURE TO STATED GOALS AND OBJECTIVES.	YES	NO	YES	NO	
PART II. ESTABLISHING POLICIES AND PROCEDURES					
SECTION D. DEFINITION OF ROLE: THE OFFICE OF INSTITUTIONAL RESEARCH IS:					
14. A NEUTRAL, INDEPENDENT AGENT WHICH SUPPLIES INFORMATION FOR DECISION MAKING RATHER THAN BEING INVOLVED IN DECISION MAKING.	YES	NO	YES	NO	
15. CONCERNED WITH THE COLLECTION OF DATA NEEDED FOR AND DIRECT INVOLVEMENT IN DEVELOPMENT, EVALUATION, AND CONTROL OF OPERATIONS.	YES	NO	YES	NO	
16. CONCERNED ONLY WITH IMMEDIATE PROBLEM SOLVING.	YES	NO	YES	NO	
17. CONCERNED WITH IMMEDIATE PROBLEM SOLVING AND LONG-RANGE, THEORETICALLY-ORIENTED RESEARCH DESIGNED TO IMPROVE THE PERFORMANCE OF THE INSTITUTION.	YES	NO	YES	NO	
SECTION E. USE OF AN ADVISORY COMMITTEE: AN ADVISORY COMMITTEE OF INSTITUTIONAL PERSONNEL:					
18. HAS BEEN ESTABLISHED TO ASSIST THE OFFICE OF INSTITUTIONAL RESEARCH.	YES	NO	YES	NO	
19. HAS ADOPTED A STATEMENT OF BASIC PRINCIPLES RELATING TO INSTITUTIONAL RESEARCH ACTIVITIES OF THE COLLEGE.	YES	NO	YES	NO	
20. ADVISED UPON PRIORITIES FOR PROPOSED INSTITUTIONAL RESEARCH PROJECTS.	YES	NO	YES	NO	
21. PROVIDE TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE IN THE PLANNING OF INSTITUTIONAL RESEARCH PROJECTS.	YES	NO	YES	NO	

SECTION F. COORDINATION OF STUDIES: THE OFFICE OF INSTITUTIONAL RESEARCH:	COLUMN 1 ACTUAL PRACTICE		COLUMN 2 DESIRED PRACTICE		COLUMN 3 RESTRAINING FORCES
22. MAINTAINS A MASTER LIST AND FILE COPIES OF ALL INSTITUTIONAL STUDIES COMPILED AND IN PROGRESS.	YES	NO	YES	NO	
23. MAINTAINS A MASTER LIST AND FILE COPIES OF LOCAL, STATE, AND NATIONAL COMMITTEE ACTIONS AND/OR CONFERENCE REPORTS WHICH RELATE TO PRESENT OR CONTEMPLATED COLLEGE POLICIES AND PROGRAMS.	YES	NO	YES	NO	
24. MAINTAINS A COMPLETE FILE OF THE ERIC-AACJC MONTHLY PUBLICATION, JUNIOR COLLEGE RESEARCH REVIEW.	YES	NO	YES	NO	
25. HAS READY ACCESS TO COMPLETE COLLECTION OF ERIC MONTHLY ABSTRACT JOURNAL, RESEARCH IN EDUCATION.	YES	NO	YES	NO	
SECTION G. PREPARATION OF REPORTS: INSTITUTIONAL RESEARCH REPORTS:					
26. SHARPEN DEFINITIONS AND DEVELOPS PROCEDURAL STANDARDS TO MAKE FOR GREATER CONSISTENCY IN DATA COLLECTION AND MAINTENANCE.	YES	NO	YES	NO	
27. IDENTIFY THE POPULATION STUDIES AND DESCRIBE THE DATA GATHERING TECHNIQUES USED.	YES	NO	YES	NO	
28. LET THE FACTS SPEAK FOR THEMSELVES.	YES	NO	YES	NO	
29. SUGGEST ALTERNATIVE COURSES OF ACTION.	YES	NO	YES	NO	
30. RECOMMEND A SPECIFIC COURSE OF ACTION.	YES	NO	YES	NO	
SECTION H. DESSEMINATION OF FINDINGS: THE CIRCULATION OF INSTITUTIONAL RESEARCH REPORTS IS:					
31. DETERMINED BY THE PRESIDENT OF THE COLLEGE.	YES	NO	YES	NO	
32. DETERMINED BY THE DIRECTOR OF INSTITUTIONAL RESEARCH.	YES	NO	YES	NO	
33. DETERMINED BY THE PURPOSE AND CONTENT OF THE STUDY.	YES	NO	YES	NO	
34. DETERMINED BY THE OFFICERS WHO REQUESTED THE STUDY.	YES	NO	YES	NO	
35. DETERMINED BY A WRITTEN STATEMENT OF POLICY.	YES	NO	YES	NO	
PART III. ORGANIZATION AND OPERATION					
SECTION I. ORGANIZATIONAL POSITION: THE DIRECTOR OF INSTITUTIONAL RESEARCH:					
36. REPORTS TO THE PRESIDENT.	YES	NO	YES	NO	
37. REPORTS TO A VICE-PRESIDENT.	YES	NO	YES	NO	
38. REPORTS TO A DEAN.	YES	NO	YES	NO	
SECTION J. LEVEL OF ACTIVITY: THE DIRECTOR OF INSTITUTIONAL RESEARCH IS:					
39. A MEMBER OF THE ADMINISTRATIVE COUNCIL.	YES	NO	YES	NO	
40. A MEMBER OF STANDING AND/OR SPECIAL STUDY COMMITTEES.	YES	NO	YES	NO	
41. A CONSULTANT OR ADVISOR TO THOSE OFFICES RESPONSIBLE FOR MAKING INSTITUTIONAL DECISIONS.	YES	NO	YES	NO	
SECTION K. FUNCTIONS OF OFFICE: THE DIRECTOR OF INSTITUTIONAL RESEARCH IS RESPONSIBLE FOR:					
42. INITIATING STUDIES.	YES	NO	YES	NO	
43. REPEATING CERTAIN STUDIES OVER A PERIOD OF TIME TO PERFECT METHODOLOGY AND IDENTIFY TREND DATA.	YES	NO	YES	NO	
44. INTERPRETING THE RESULTS OF STUDIES.	YES	NO	YES	NO	
45. COMPLETING QUESTIONNAIRES SEEKING INSTITUTIONAL DATA.	YES	NO	YES	NO	
46. CONDUCTING STUDIES OF PRACTICES AT OTHER COLLEGES.	YES	NO	YES	NO	
SECTION L. DEMANDS OF OFFICE: THE OFFICE OF INSTITUTIONAL RESEARCH IS COORDINATED BY:					
47. AN ADMINISTRATOR ON A FULL-TIME BASIS.	YES	NO	YES	NO	
48. AN ADMINISTRATOR ON A PART-TIME BASIS (E.G. REGISTRAR, DEAN OF STUDIES, ETC.).	YES	NO	YES	NO	
49. A FACULTY MEMBER ON A PART-TIME BASIS.	YES	NO	YES	NO	
SECTION M. SPECIAL QUALIFICATIONS: THE DIRECTOR OF INSTITUTIONAL RESEARCH:					
50. HAS HAD TEACHING EXPERIENCE IN A COMMUNITY/JUNIOR COLLEGE.	YES	NO	YES	NO	
51. HAS HAD ADMINISTRATIVE EXPERIENCE IN A COMMUNITY/ JUNIOR COLLEGE.	YES	NO	YES	NO	
52. IS A GENERALIST, ACQUAINTED WITH ALL ASPECTS OF COMMUNITY/JUNIOR COLLEGE OPERATIONS.	YES	NO	YES	NO	
53. HAS A GRADUATE MAJOR IN EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH AND STATISTICS.	YES	NO	YES	NO	

SECTION M (CONTD.)	COLUMN 1 ACTUAL PRACTICE		COLUMN 2 DESIRED PRACTICE		COLUMN 3 RESTRAINING FORCES
54. HAS HAD GRADUATE COURSE WORK IN HIGHER EDUCATION.	YES	NO	YES	NO	
55. HAS HAD GRADUATE COURSE WORK IN EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH AND STATISTICS.	YES	NO	YES	NO	
56. IS KNOWLEDGEABLE ABOUT THE CAPABILITIES OF ELEMENTS OF ELECTRONIC DATA PROCESSING.	YES	NO	YES	NO	
57. USES ELECTRONIC DATA PROCESSING IN DATA STORING AND ANALYSIS.	YES	NO	YES	NO	
SECTION N. FINANCIAL SUPPORT: THE OFFICE OF INSTITUTIONAL RESEARCH HAS FUNDS:					
58. FOR DATA PROCESSING SERVICES.	YES	NO	YES	NO	
59. FOR SECRETARIAL AND DUPLICATING SERVICES.	YES	NO	YES	NO	
60. TO ENABLE THE DIRECTOR TO PARTICIPATE IN CONFERENCES AND/OR SHORT COURSES AND INSTITUTES.	YES	NO	YES	NO	
61. FOR INSTITUTIONAL MEMBERSHIP IN APPROPRIATE ORGANIZATIONS.	YES	NO	YES	NO	
62. TO UTILIZE CONSULTANTS TO ASSIST IN THE DESIGN AND EVALUATION OF SPECIAL STUDIES.	YES	NO	YES	NO	
63. FOR ACQUISITION OF REFERENCE MATERIALS.	YES	NO	YES	NO	
64. PROVIDED BY A SEPARATE ITEM IN THE COLLEGE BUDGET.	YES	NO	YES	NO	
SECTION O. FACILITIES: THE OFFICE OF INSTITUTIONAL RESEARCH:					
65. DEFINES RELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN PRESENT SPACE UTILIZATION AND REQUESTS FOR ADDITIONAL SPACE.	YES	NO	YES	NO	
66. DEFINES THE NATURE OF SPACE NEEDS (E.G., GENERAL PURPOSE CLASSROOMS, SPECIALIZED SPACES).	YES	NO	YES	NO	
67. DEFINES THE PRIORITIES TO BE ESTABLISHED FOR CONSTRUCTION.	YES	NO	YES	NO	
68. HAS APPROPRIATE FACILITIES AND EQUIPMENT TO HOUSE THE OFFICE OF INSTITUTIONAL RESEARCH.	YES	NO	YES	NO	

PART IV. SUPPLEMENTARY DATA

69. WHAT IS THE OFFICIAL CURRENT ENROLLMENT IN CREDIT COURSES IN YOUR COLLEGE?
    A. _____ FULL-TIME STUDENTS (CARRYING 12 OR MORE QUARTER HOURS)
    B. _____ PART-TIME STUDENTS
70. WHAT IS THE YEAR YOUR COLLEGE WAS FOUNDED?
    YEAR: _____
71. WHAT YEAR WAS YOUR OFFICE OF INSTITUTIONAL RESEARCH ESTABLISHED?
    YEAR: _____
72. HAS YOUR COLLEGE EXPERIENCED AN AVERAGE INCREASE OR DECREASE IN ENROLLMENT OVER THE PAST THREE YEARS?
    A. ___ INCREASE _____%
    B. ___ DECREASE _____%

YOUR COOPERATION IS GREATLY APPRECIATED. PLEASE USE THE ENCLOSED STAMPED ENVELOPE AND RETURN THIS QUESTIONNAIRE TO:

CHARLES D. CHALKER, DIRECTOR
INSTITUTIONAL RESEARCH
ENTERPRISE STATE JUNIOR COLLEGE
POST OFFICE BOX 1300
ENTERPRISE, ALABAMA 36330

ERIC Clearinghouse for Junior Colleg
96 Powell Library Building
University of California
Los Angeles, California 90024

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT: THIS QUESTIONNAIRE ADAPTED FROM ONE BY
JOSEPH A. GREENBERG

SEP 25 1981